



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,971	09/26/2005	David T Scadden	61925US(51588)	1957
71284	7590	10/17/2007	EXAMINER	
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP			BELYAVSKYI, MICHAEL A	
P.O. BOX 55874			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOSTON, MA 02205			1644	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/17/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/521,971	SCADDEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Michail A. Belyavskyi	1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-11 and 23-40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 12-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 January 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-40 are pending.

Applicant's election with traverse of Group III, claims 12-22 in the reply filed on 07/30/07 is acknowledged. The traverse is on the grounds that the search of Groups I-VIII together would not constitute a serious search burden on the examiner and that search of the claims of Group III would provide useful information for the claims of other groups.

This is not found persuasive because as has been stated in the previous Office Action, mailed on 05/30/07, the inventions listed as Groups I-VIII do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features when viewed over the prior art and thus they do not have a single general inventive concept and so lack unity of invention.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 1-11 and 23-40 are withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner, 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected inventions.

*Claims 12-22 read on a method for enhancing the growth or maintenance of hematopoietic progenitor cells in a subject comprising administering to the subject an agent that activates the PTH/PTHRP receptor are under consideration in the instant application.*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

*(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.*

*(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.*

*(c) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 37(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.*

3. Claims 12-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,316410.

US Patent '410 teaches a method of treating a subject in need of such treatment, comprising administering an effective amount PTH or PTH analogue ( see entire document, Abstract and column 7 in particular). It is noted that US Patent '410 does not explicitly teach that administering of said PTH would enhance the growth of hematopoietic progenitor cells. However, the referenced method administered the same treatment, i.e. PTH or PTH analogue to the same subject in need of such treatment. Under the principles of inherency, if the prior art structure, is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. For example in Atlas Powder Co. V. IRECO, 51 USPQ2d 1943 (Fed. Cir. 1999); the following was noted. "Artisans of ordinary skill may not recognize the inherent characteristics or functioning of the prior art. However, the discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer. " The Court further held that "this same reasoning holds true when it is not a property but an ingredient which is inherently contained in the prior art". See MPEP 2112.02. Also, see Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Laboratories, Inc. 58 USPQ2d 1508 (CAFC 2001); Ex parte Novitski 26 USPQ 1389 (BPAI 1993); Mehl/Biophile International Corp. V. Milgraum, 52 USPQ2d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 1999); Atlas Powder Co. V. IRECO, 51 USPQ2d 1943 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Thus, it does not appear that the claim language or limitations result in a manipulative difference in the method steps when compared to the prior art disclosure. See Bristol-Myers Squibb Company v. Ben Venue Laboratories 58 USPQ2d 1508 (CAFC 2001). "{i}t is a general rule that merely discovering and claiming a new benefit of an old process cannot render the process again patentable". In re Woodruff, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990). The mechanism of action does not have a bearing on the patentability of the invention if the invention was already known or obvious. Mere recognition of latent properties in the prior art does not render nonobvious an otherwise known invention. In re Wiseman, 201 USPQ 658 (CCPA 1979). Granting a patent on the discovery of an unknown but inherent function would remove from the public that which is in the public domain by virtue of its inclusion in, or obviousness from, the prior art. In re Baxter Travenol Labs, 21 USPQ2d 1281 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See M.P.E.P. 2145.

The reference teaching anticipates the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1644

4. Claims 12-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5747456.

US Patent '456 teaches a method of treating a subject in need of such treatment, comprising administering an effective amount PTH or PTH analogue ( see entire document, Abstract and column 2 in particular). It is noted that US Patent '456 does not explicitly teaches that administering of said PTH would enhanced the growth of hematopoietic progenitor cells. However, the referenced method administered the same treatment, i.e. PTH or PTH analogue to the same subject in need of such treatment. Under the principles of inherency, if the prior art structure , is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. For example in Atlas Powder Co. V. IRECO, 51 USPQ2d 1943 (Fed. Cir. 1999); the following was noted. "Artisans of ordinary skill may not recognize the inherent characteristics or functioning of the prior art. However, the discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer. " The Court further held that "this same reasoning holds true when it is not a property but an ingredient which is inherently contained in the prior art". See MPEP 2112.02. Also, see Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Laboratories, Inc. 58 USPQ2d 1508 (CA FC 2001); Ex parte Novitski 26 USPQ 1389 (BPAI 1993); Mehl/Biophile International Corp. V. Milgraum, 52 USPQ2d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 1999); Atlas Powder Co. V. IRECO, 51 USPQ2d 1943 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Thus, it does not appear that the claim language or limitations result in a manipulative difference in the method steps when compared to the prior art disclosure. See Bristol-Myers Squibb Company v. Ben Venue Laboratories 58 USPQ2d 1508 (CAFC 2001). "{i}t is a general rule that merely discovering and claiming a new benefit of an old process cannot render the process again patentable". In re Woodruff, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990). The mechanism of action does not have a bearing on the patentability of the invention if the invention was already known or obvious. Mere recognition of latent properties in the prior art does not render nonobvious an otherwise known invention. In re Wiseman, 201 USPQ 658 (CCPA 1979). Granting a patent on the discovery of an unknown but inherent function would remove from the public that which is in the public domain by virtue of its inclusion in, or obviousness from, the prior art. In re Baxter Travenol Labs, 21 USPQ2d 1281 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See M.P.E.P. 2145.

The reference teaching anticipates the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1644

5. Claims 12-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,342,477 (IDS).

US Patent '477 teaches a method of treating a subject in need of such treatment, comprising administering an effective amount PTH or PTH analogue ( see entire document, Abstract and column 7 in particular). It is noted that US Patent '477 does not explicitly teach that administering of said PTH would enhance the growth of hematopoietic progenitor cells. However, the referenced method administered the same treatment, i.e. PTH or PTH analogue to the same subject in need of such treatment. Under the principles of inherency, if the prior art structure, is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. For example in Atlas Powder Co. V. IRECO, 51 USPQ2d 1943 (Fed. Cir. 1999); the following was noted. "Artisans of ordinary skill may not recognize the inherent characteristics or functioning of the prior art. However, the discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer. " The Court further held that "this same reasoning holds true when it is not a property but an ingredient which is inherently contained in the prior art". See MPEP 2112.02. Also, see Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Laboratories, Inc. 58 USPQ2d 1508 (CA FC 2001); Ex parte Novitski 26 USPQ 1389 (BPAI 1993); Mehl/Biophile International Corp. V. Milgraum, 52 USPQ2d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 1999); Atlas Powder Co. V. IRECO, 51 USPQ2d 1943 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Thus, it does not appear that the claim language or limitations result in a manipulative difference in the method steps when compared to the prior art disclosure. See Bristol-Myers Squibb Company v. Ben Venue Laboratories 58 USPQ2d 1508 (CAFC 2001). "{i}t is a general rule that merely discovering and claiming a new benefit of an old process cannot render the process again patentable". In re Woodruff, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990). The mechanism of action does not have a bearing on the patentability of the invention if the invention was already known or obvious. Mere recognition of latent properties in the prior art does not render nonobvious an otherwise known invention. In re Wiseman, 201 USPQ 658 (CCPA 1979). Granting a patent on the discovery of an unknown but inherent function would remove from the public that which is in the public domain by virtue of its inclusion in, or obviousness from, the prior art. In re Baxter Travenol Labs, 21 USPQ2d 1281 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See M.P.E.P. 2145.

The reference teaching anticipates the claimed invention.

6. No claim is allowed.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michail Belyavskyi whose telephone number is 571/272-0840. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on 571/272-0841.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571/273-8300

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



MICHAIL BELYAVSKYI, PH.D.  
PATENT EXAMINER

10/10/07